



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

was seen at the same time in a number of individuals. One of these had beside the normal one-flowered about six others with two or three subsessile flowers in the bracts. In one instance the third flower was neutral having "sepals" alone. This condition was not one of fasciation as the usual flattened peduncles of greater diameter in one way were absent and the stalks appeared no different than in normal. In several cases the usual three bracts were present and the supernumerary flowers came from these in umbel fashion. In one case two flowers were found at the end of a common pedicel (bracts some distance below) and on a common receptacle or double torus. In several the outer bracts of the cluster were 2 to 3-lobed or notched. The several flowers had very distinct pedicels nearly all with their own secondary bracts and only one bractless. In another a bent one-bracted node or joint was found at the base of the several pedicels of the umbel-like cluster. Still, another more peculiar specimen consisted of a peduncle with a larger bract near the top. From the axis of this arose two pedicels, one with a normal flower, the other with two flowers on a common torus. The larger of these two had three three-notched bracts and the other two three-notched bracts at the apex.

A CORRECTION NEEDING CORRECTION.

Some years ago the term macrospore for the larger non-sexual specialized reproductive cell of the heterosporous pteridophyta was found objectionable because the name was deemed inaccurate in meaning. The word *μακρός* (macros) in Greek means "long" and the spores in question are not long but large, or big. It might have been thought by some more or less conservative botanists of the "laissez faire" type that the attempt at correction might be considered as fastidiousness. Scientists, however ought to be exact especially in their terminology, though an equally industrious attempt to correct nomenclature usually raises a clamor among the morphologists who carp at continual name changing. Be this as it may, the object in question suggests rather the idea of largeness, and hence ought to have come from the Greek word *μέγας* (megas). The name was accordingly changed to "megaspore" and in a few months it was even enthusiastically received by all without exception, and, as far as we

can find, still holds sway. We wondered at the time the name was proposed, how long it would take to find that though correctly derived as to its meaning it is grammatically wrong in form. In fact we have after these number of years without shadow of suspicion on the part of many, had to endure an etymological monstrosity, which has not only been taken up into the terminology of the science but accepted by otherwise reputed scientists, and that without any question as to the credentials of the correction deserving commendation.

A mere beginner in Greek literature would have known from his first few lessons in that language that any name coming from the word μέγας, fem., μεγάλη, neut. μέγα, having the genitive μέγαλον, must according to the rules for the derivation of words in the ancient languages come from the root of the word. The root of the word in question is μεγαλ-, from the genitive μέγαλον. The name then should have been **megalospore**, the "O" being inserted before consonants. The taking of the simple nominative case of a word may be an easy way for the name tinkers, but it is as unpardonable to burden a nomenclature or a terminology with these mongrel names, as is the using of a plural form of verb with a singular subject. The former moreover is not nearly as uncommon as one would at first suspect. It may be said on the one hand that this matter is not strictly botanical in relevance and of minor moment, but the dignity of a science merits better from its makers of names. On the other hand it may be asked "Why was not attention called sooner to the matter? instead of criticizing when perhaps too late?" It is to us still a matter of wonder that the name was not sooner amended, and perhaps, such is the indifference on the part of our writers or maybe rather ignorance, that the results might have been the same in the long run anyway.

As an example of the proper use of names with μέγας we have the following plant names, and more may be found in the Index Kewensis: *Magalodonta*, Greene, *Megalotropus*, *Megalachne*. On the other hand *Megastachya*, *Megastigma* show that our nomenclature as well as our terminology may be improved. Moreover as the name of the group of so-called brown algae we say *Melanophyceae* (instead of the incorrect *Melaphyceae*) though the derivation is from the Greek word μέλας, μέλαινα, μέλαν, meaning black.